

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 197

EA 019 681

AUTHOR Kimpston, Richard D.; Rogers, Karen B.
TITLE Collaborative Curriculum Planning: Does the Process
Contribute to Changes in Attitudes toward
Curriculum?
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
(Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987). Tables may
reproduce poorly due to small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference
Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Cooperation; *Curriculum
Development; Educational Planning; Elementary
Secondary Education; *Participative Decision Making;
Suburban Schools; *Teacher Administrator
Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Because professional involvement in curriculum development is now commonplace in U.S. schools, it is imperative to consider the participants, their curriculum planning views, and the relationship of these views to the planning process. This paper describes a three-year study to determine whether the initial predispositions of participating teachers and principals were changed as a result of their active involvement in the collaborative curriculum planning process in a large Midwestern suburban school district consisting of 15,000 students and 750 teachers. The first year of the project (Phase 1) concentrated on defining the project's expectations, documenting the current district curriculum, and planning development activities. Phase 2 focused on developing new curricular components and revision recommendations for each content area. A curriculum system was also developed for implementing, maintaining, and evaluating the new content areas. Phase 3 involved implementing the new curricula in the four content areas (art, guidance, computers, and science) identified as needing immediate revision during the second phase. During all three phases, committees comprised of principals and teachers collaborated on various tasks. Findings show that teachers and principals involved in a broad-based curriculum planning process can reach consensus about curriculum uses. Furthermore, the more opportunities for curriculum planning of any sort, the more favorably teachers will view curriculum work. Several additional insights about participants are also summarized. Included are two tables containing data from the three phases of the curriculum planning project and instruments administered, respectively. (MLH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED287197

Collaborative Curriculum Planning:
Does The Process Contribute To Changes
In Attitudes Toward Curriculum?

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard D.
Kimpston

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Richard D. Kimpston
~~Associate~~ Professor
Curriculum Systems
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

Karen B. Rogers
Instructor
Graduate Studies In Education and
Community Services
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, MN

To be presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational
Research Association, Washington, D.C.
April, 1987

EA 019681

Collaborative Curriculum Planning: Does the Process Contribute to
Changes in Attitude Toward Curriculum?

Presently there is a strong and growing expectation in the United States that schools will employ systematic procedures in curriculum planning decisions, with a broad base of professional involvement. This expectation cannot be ignored as one even cursorily reviews the current educational literature, job descriptions for curriculum leaders, state directives to school districts and recent state legislation.

In this atmosphere of participation and systematic decision-making, it is imperative that we consider the participants, their views about curriculum planning, and the relationship of these views to the planning process. In the three-year study described in this paper, a focus was maintained on whether or not the initial predispositions of the participants were changed as a result of their actual involvement in the collaborative curriculum planning process.

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

From the 1960's to the present, teachers' associations have pressed for greater teacher participation in curricular decision making. In fact, many researchers have concluded that participation in decision-making results in greater job satisfaction, higher productivity, lower costs, and greater commitment to and personal integration into an organization (for example, Alutto & Belasco, 1972; Myers, 1970; Likert, 1967; Garms, Gutherie & Pierce, 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1975).

Because participation in decision-making was thought to be desirable for both teachers and the school district, the notion grew that teachers desired such involvement. Alutto & Belasco (1972) concluded, however, that reduction in shared decision-making responsibilities provided the greatest personal and organizational benefits for decisionally saturated teachers. Subsequent research (Ponder & Bulcock, 1976; Hoy & Miskel, 1978) revealed that teachers' desire for participation in decision-making depended on the kinds of decisions, the amount of expertise they believe they bring to the process and the degree to which they are required to participate. When participation in curriculum planning goes beyond the classroom level, much skepticism about personal benefits as well as the success of their efforts has resulted (Duke, Showers & Imbel, 1980). However, time and time again researchers have argued that teachers' perceptions of active participation in curriculum development and actual involvement of teachers in the development process significantly affect the successful implementation of a curricular innovation (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Young, 1979).

Though principals express interest in curriculum planning, research suggests that they are not necessarily natural curriculum and instructional leaders (Fullan, 1981; Eastabrook & Fullan, 1979). Lippitt (1967) has argued, however, that the principal sets the tone for curriculum change and that when active, teachers reap the benefits. Common (1981), among others has suggested that principals do create a

supportive climate for change, maximize teacher participation in that change and ultimately create a system to promote change, when their attitudes toward the change are communicated.

In general, teacher and principal attitudes toward participation in curriculum planning have been found to range from positive to apathetic to negative; yet, the fact remains that both groups are increasingly involved in curriculum planning. At this point it is evident that we have some ideas concerning the benefits of collaborative curriculum planning, but little is known what predispositions toward curriculum, nor what expectations and attitudes these two groups of potential participants bring to curriculum planning, and how their initial views affect subsequent perceptions of the planning process and product. The three-year study described here in is thought to shed some light on this heretofore relatively unstudied area.

STUDY METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Setting of the Study

The study was carried out in one large Midwest suburban school district consisting of 15,000 students and 750 teachers. The district had determined that its entire curriculum in every content area should be assessed and a system developed for its revision and maintenance. The entire development project was planned to cover a three-year period. Year One focused on the analysis phase of the curriculum planning project. In this stage, the process and expectations for the entire

Collaborative Planning

project were defined, the current district curriculum was documented, and the development activities for the second phase were planned.

Phase Two began with the second year of the project and focused on the development of new curricular components and recommendations for revision for each content area (specifically, rationales, goals, objectives and content outlines). During this phase a curriculum system was developed for implementing, maintaining, and evaluating the newly developed content area curricula on a cyclical basis.

Phase Three began near the end of the second year of the Project and focused on the initial implementation of the new curricula in the four content areas (art, guidance, computers, and science) identified as most needy of immediate revision during the second phase process.

Participants

At the beginning of Phase One, a Curriculum Steering Committee was formed, composed of 16 teachers who were content specialists and 16 principals. The primary tasks of the Steering Committee were to: (1) plan and organize the documentation process; (2) lead the actual documentation process; and (3) organize the second and third phase of the curriculum development project. A Curriculum Documentation Team was formed at this time, composed of 114 teachers and 16 principals. The primary tasks of this team were to: (1) collect data on current programs in each content area; (2) define the goals and topics covered by current programs; and (3) document these programs in written form. A Citizens' Steering Committee, composed of four community members', was

Collaborative Planning

also formed during Phase One. Their primary objective was to develop a series of seminars and meetings to help educate community members who intended to participate in the district development project. The Citizens' Curriculum Committee, which comprised 54 district community members, was charged with the tasks of: (1) learning about the process of curriculum development; and (2) determining the role it wished to play in the subsequent curriculum development process in Phase Two. During Phase Two, the participants and their expected roles changed considerably. The Curriculum Steering Committee continued to play an active planning role. Their primary tasks were to: (1) plan the tasks for each content "task force"; (2) develop a system for reviewing and prioritizing the curriculum components developed by each content area "task force"; and, (3) plan the in-servicing required of participants in this second phase of the project. The Curriculum Documentation Team had disbanded in this phase, since its appointed task had been completed in Phase One. In its stead, 16 Content Area Task Forces were formed, each comprised of one teacher and one principal as co-leaders and 5-10 teachers and community members. The primary tasks of each Content Area Task Force were to: (1) develop a mutually agreeable, comprehensive rationale and set of goals and objectives for the content area; (2) recommend possible content outlines where needed; and, (3) develop a list of prioritized tasks to be undertaken in the implementation, maintenance and evaluation of the newly developed curriculum for Phase Three. The Citizens' Curriculum Steering Committee was also disbanded

Collaborative Planning

in Phase Two, as was the Citizens' Curriculum Committee. The 54 community members involved in Phase One were assigned membership on the individual content area task forces according to their areas of interest or expertise. Each task force had two to eight of the Phase One community participants on its rolls.

During this second year of the project, each Task Force met on its own time schedule. In general, each Task Force followed the same basic procedure: (1) collect information about "ideal" goals and objectives for the content area; (2) decide which goals and objectives were feasible and desirable in the district; (3) develop a written rationale for the content area; and, (4) make and prioritize recommendations for curriculum changes (ways to eliminate any discrepancies between the district's "what is" in that content area, based on the curriculum documentation for that area, and the "what should be") as determined by the investigations of the respective task forces.

During Phase Three of the curriculum development project the Curriculum Steering Committee, renamed the Faculty Curriculum Council, continued to oversee the implementation of all curriculum changes in the four identified focus areas that would affect more than one building. Membership decreased slightly to 20, a number deemed most effective for group decision-making by the district administration. The 16 Content Area Task Forces were disbanded due to the completion of their assigned tasks. In their stead, 16 Content Area Steering Committees were formed, comprised primarily of the teachers and principals who had worked on the

Collaborative Planning

Content Area Task Forces. Numbers of participants on each Steering Committee varied, depending upon the year in the curriculum cycle in which a content area was involved. The largest Steering Committees became the four content areas identified as priority curriculum implementation and revision areas at the end of the second phase. Approximately 32 members of the previous Task Forces took on these new roles. Community participation at this stage was significantly decreased to 16 members who were invited to sit on a Citizens' Curriculum Council. Their role was to review and advise the district curriculum director on their reactions to the program changes proposed by the four Content Steering Committees and previously approved by the Faculty Curriculum Council. Table One summarizes the functions and roles of the various committees and teams involved in the collaborative process across the three phases of the district project.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Method and Instrumentation

At the first joint meeting of the two teacher/principal committees involved in Phase One, the Teacher/Administrator Self Analysis Inventory (TSAI) was administered to all 134 participants. The TSAI was developed by Beauchamp (1974) to describe and measure teacher behaviors and attitudes toward curriculum plans and planning. The inventory consists

of 51 statements to which the respondent indicates each statement as accurate, inaccurate, more accurate than inaccurate, or more inaccurate than accurate. The items measure respondents' perceptions of how their curriculum is used, whether or not the curriculum is self-sufficient, and what relationship exists between curriculum and textbook. In previous use of this instrument, the Cronbach Alpha Reliability coefficient was .85.

At completion of the documentation process several months later, both groups were asked to describe their perceptions of the process and the product with which they had been involved. Hall's (1976) Process Scale and Product Scale were used as part of this perceptual assessment, in addition to the Expectations/Satisfaction Questionnaire (ESQ) developed by the researchers (Kimpston & Rogers, 1984). This allowed the researchers the opportunity to monitor and evaluate the actual processes involved in planning during this phase of the project. The results of these observations have been reported in a previous article (Kimpston and Rogers, in press). A 99 percent response rate was received in this first phase measurement due to the fact that all respondents filled out the instruments at joint meetings.

To continue to measure the perceptions of process and product as roles changed, the ESQ, Hall Process Scale and Hall Product Scale were administered through the school mail to the 134 teacher, principal and community participants in Phase Two. An overall response rate of 86

percent was obtained from participants in this phase using this method of measurement.

In Phase Three, the TSAI was readministered to the 134 original participants of the three-year project in order to determine whether or not there had been significant changes in these participants' views on the use of the district curriculum. The TSAI was also administered to a stratified random sample of 146 teachers in the district who had not been involved in the project, to determine whether or not the participation itself might affect teachers' views on the use of the district curriculum. To probe more deeply into teachers' actual attitudes and behaviors toward curriculum work, the Langenbach Curriculum Attitudes Inventory (CAI) was also administered to both the participant and non-participant groups. The CAI was developed by Langenbach (1969) to describe and measure teachers' attitudes toward who should develop curriculum and how well it is ultimately used. The inventory consists of 50 statements to which the respondent indicates each statement on a six-point scale, from I agree very much, I agree on the whole, I agree more than I disagree, I disagree more than I agree, I disagree on the whole, to I disagree very much. In previous use, the reliability estimates of the instrument, determined by the Hoyt's Analysis of Variance technique, were .54 and .66 for the initial administrations of the instrument. Administration of these two instruments to the two groups of teachers and principals was through the school mail. A return response rate of 76 percent was obtained through

this method. Table Two displays the different instruments administered to the differing groups of participants and non-participants over the three years of the curriculum planning project.

Insert Table Two About Here

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

TSAI Analysis and Results

Analysis of Variance was used to determine attitudinal and behavioral differences measured by the TSAI between (1) teachers and administrators during Phase One, and (2) teachers and administrators during Phase Three. The Repeat Measure T-test was used to measure differences between the initial and subsequent attitudes of the three-year participants in the project. ANOVA's were also run to measure differences in attitude toward curriculum planning among participating and non-participating teachers in the district.

Initial attitudes differed significantly between teachers and principals in how each group felt the district curriculum was used in the development of learning objectives, the selection of materials, the communication of goals and the development of learning experiences. Principals reported less certainty about the adequacy of the district curriculum and felt more strongly that it should be changed. They felt

Collaborative Planning

more strongly than any of the grade levels of teachers that a textbook, well chosen, precludes the need for supplementary materials and is most useful for developing lesson plans, planning instructional activities, developing test questions and for selecting supplementary instructional materials. Principals also felt more strongly than teachers that the curriculum provides the topics for instruction, does provide for individual needs, and adequately provides for the teaching of basic skills. Furthermore, principals perceived a much more extensive reliance by teachers on commercial packages and supplementary instructional materials for the development of learning activities than was reported by the teachers themselves.

After close collaboration between the two groups for the three-year period, it was found that principals underwent the strongest changes in attitude about curriculum, coming into much closer agreement with teachers in how the curriculum should be used. Despite this closer agreement, some significant differences remained. Principals continued to feel more strongly than teachers that the curriculum was useful as a means of communicating the objectives and philosophy of the district. They continued to perceive heavier reliance by teachers on the textbook as the major source for planning and designing classroom activities and for developing test questions and student evaluation procedures than the teachers reported of their actual behaviors. Likewise, principals were significantly more confident that teachers did not rely on the existing curriculum, but rather departed from or adapted it in providing for

individual student needs and the teaching of specific basic skills than the teachers themselves reported. Furthermore, principals more strongly believed that teachers relied on commercial packages for the design and development of classroom activities than did the teachers themselves report. Teachers, on the other hand, were significantly more positive that they relied on the curriculum to develop test questions and student evaluations. They continued to report a lack of general knowledge about the adequacy of the school district's curriculum, but reported significantly more positive reliance on it in deciding on and purchasing supplementary instructional materials for the design of classroom activities.

A few strong and significant changes appeared to occur in the participants' general attitudes and behaviors toward curriculum plans and planning over the three-year period. Participants reported significantly less reliance upon textbooks as the main source of instructional materials or for designing the sequence of lesson plans, for the actual planning of learning activities, or for the development of test questions and student evaluation techniques than was described at the beginning of the project.

When ANOVA's were run to determine if some participants in the three-year process changed more than others, teachers at the middle school and high school levels were found to be much more likely to change their initial attitudes over time than were primary and intermediate teachers. At the end of Phase Three, middle school

Collaborative Planning

teachers felt more strongly than they had at the beginning that the district curriculum was the best source for the development of lesson plans, while high school teachers felt less strongly about this issue. A similar pattern was found in attitudinal changes for looking to the curriculum as the main source for the development of units of work and classroom activities, with middle school teachers becoming more favorable on these issues and high school teachers significantly less favorable. Middle school teachers were more likely, moreover, to rely on the curriculum for the development of instructional objectives for their courses and classes than were high school teachers. On the need to adapt, modify or depart from the district curriculum at times, middle school teachers were the only grade level group to significantly change their beliefs on this issue between the first and third phases. Only one other significant change in attitudes as it related to differing grade levels of teachers was found in the study: primary, intermediate and middle school teachers all reported feeling significantly more knowledgeable about the district curriculum at the end of their participation than reported initially, while high school teachers felt they knew less than they initially had reported as a group.

ANOVA's run to determine if teachers more than principals had changed their initial attitudes toward curriculum plans and planning also produced some significant results. On the issue of reliance upon the curriculum for the development of test questions and student evaluation techniques, teachers continued to report this as the usual

planning procedure, although both groups became generally more positive concerning the benefits of such a practice. Conversely, on the beliefs that the textbook can preclude the need for additional instructional materials and resources, principals felt more strongly on these issues initially and continued to do so at the end of the project, although both groups were significantly less positive on this issue than initially reported. Principals were also significantly more favorable toward the practice of relying upon the textbook for the development of classroom activities and lesson plans initially and significantly increased these views over the time of their participation in the project. Only teachers reported feeling much more knowledgeable about the district curriculum at the end of their participation. Principals more so than teachers did report less of a feeling that the district curriculum was inadequate for the teaching of specific basic skills and the development of specific classroom activities after their involvement in the planning project.

CAI Analysis and Results

ANOVA's were run to determine if there were differences in responses to the CAI by position, project participation, level of experience with curriculum work, age, sex, and grade level. No significant differences were found for age nor for whether or not the respondent had been involved in the three year project. Significant differences were found, however, for some beliefs reflected on the CAI for level of experience with curriculum work, position, sex, and grade

level. Generally, the more experience a respondent previously had with curriculum work, the more favorably he/she viewed how the curriculum was used, the purpose and place of the textbook within the curriculum, the usefulness of curriculum planning meetings, and the ultimate usefulness of a district curriculum. Reliance on the text as the instructional planner was greeted significantly more favorably by men teachers. Teachers were more positive about collaborative curriculum planning which might include outside experts and community members than were principals. Middle school teachers were more positive than all other levels of teachers on the ways in which curriculum should be used, while high school teachers were less positive on this issue than any other grade levels except primary teachers. On the usefulness of the text as a major source of lesson plans and classroom activities, high school teachers were significantly more positive than any other levels.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicated that principals and teachers when collaboratively involved in a broad-based curriculum planning process can reach general consensus about how curriculum should be used. The results reported here revealed several insights about project participants, which will be summarized and discussed in the paragraphs that follow. One strength and unexpected contribution of this case study was the depth of description about curriculum planning processes which the five instruments used over the three-year period were able to provide. Correlations were high among items on the various instruments

concerned with similar aspects of the curriculum processes and products (e.g., goals, leadership, atmosphere, feasibility of results). Thus, the significant relationships measured between participation and perception of process and product were doubly validated. The method used to observe this collaborative planning process and its resultant products may prove to be a viable one for a variety of curriculum planning processes, even beyond the processes of analysis and development undertaken in this project.

Despite the numerous strengths and findings in this case study, its limitations must also be mentioned. First and foremost, it is important to keep in mind the difficulty of generalizing case study data, even with the amount of data collected and the size of this study sample. Second, there is always the potential for inaccuracy when collecting data based on self-report. It was felt, however, that the close contact and frequent discussions with district personnel maintained throughout the three year period helped to verify the accuracy of trends measured by the multiple instruments used and the correlations found among those instruments. With these limitations in mind, then, the general insights uncovered by this three-year case study may now be summarized.

Insight One: It is possible for teachers and principals to work collaboratively in curriculum planning and development when the goals and tasks of that process are clearly defined and supported by the district administration. A high degree of cooperation and equality of group participation was reported by teachers and principals as they

worked together on this project. As the "before" and "after" attitudes of the participants in this project indicated, the significantly different views of principals and teachers on reliance upon curriculum and textbook narrowed considerably over the time of the project. Neither group changed their views entirely, but each came closer to agreeing upon the ultimate use of the curriculum and the text. Over the period of the project each group came to feel less reliance should be put on the text as the major source of lesson planning, classroom resources and materials, and evaluation, and that more reliance should be placed upon the curriculum itself as the source of these teaching activities. It seems apparent that the actual involvement of these participants in the curriculum documentation, development and implementation process led to increased confidence in the ultimate usefulness of the district's curriculum.

Insight Two: Principals don't really know what the classroom teacher does within the classroom walls. In measuring the initial perception of principals toward the use teachers make of the curriculum and the textbook, there were wide and significant discrepancies between how much reliance the principals thought teachers placed on these products and how much reliance teachers actually reported placing upon these products. Even after a close, three-year collaboration, principals continued to differ significantly in these perceptions, although the gap had narrowed a great deal. If communication is to remain open and healthy between staff and administration such a gap must be narrowed as

much as possible. If, then, curricular collaboration does not provide the means, what else can be suggested? Certainly collaborative curriculum planning has been shown in this case study to open communication between the two groups, but something more must be found to keep the lines open.

Insight Three: The involvement of principals in curriculum planning processes may lead to an increase in their ability to act as effective curriculum and instructional leaders. As previous research has suggested, principals do not come by such leadership naturally (Eastabrook & Fullan, 1979), yet as this study confirmed, actual involvement in this project led to large and significant changes in the principals' attitudes toward the curriculum and teachers' actual use of that curriculum. Over the course of their involvement, principals came to view their leadership skills in the process very positively and reported themselves as knowledgeable about the actual curriculum the district had in place. Such changes must be viewed as healthy if we are to believe the body of research reaching as far back as Lippitt (1967) on the role of the principal in setting the tone for curriculum change and implementation.

Insight Four: Participants bring to a curriculum planning process certain attitudes and beliefs that may initially influence their perceptions of that process and the resultant product, but these attitudes and beliefs become increasingly more positive as the degree and breadth of involvement continues to increase over a period of time.

Collaborative Planning

In this case study, significant changes were found in participants' perceptions of the usefulness and adequacy of their district curriculum. Both groups had initially reported strong feelings that their curriculum was inadequate for delineating instructional objectives, for communicating learning goals to parents, and for developing classroom activities and materials. At the end of the three-year period, classroom teachers, in particular, were significantly more confident that the curriculum they had developed and begun to implement could do these things. It was interesting to note the significant changes found among middle school teachers in particular. In the first phase of the study, this group reported significantly more positive perceptions of the process in which they had been involved (Kimpston & Rogers, in press). Then at the end of their involvement they were the group singled out for the biggest changes in reported reliance upon the curriculum as the source for their instructional and evaluation planning. Can it be that middle school teachers have indeed been the "middle child" of the school family, the group without a curriculum or a textbook to call their own in most subjects, due to the disparate physical and cognitive needs of their students? It may be that this group in general has viewed a district curriculum as not flexible enough to meet the disparate needs of their students and likewise found no ideal textbook to meet the disparate cognitive needs of their students. Whether or not it was the involvement in the actual development of new curriculum to meet their class needs or just increased awareness of what

Collaborative Planning

the district curriculum could offer them to meet these needs, the middle school teachers most certainly developed an increased and healthy reliance upon the curriculum to aid them in instructional planning.

These findings generally confirm previous findings on the importance of involvement and its ultimate influence upon teacher and principal support of a curriculum innovation (for example, Young, 1979; Common, 1981; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977).

Insight Five: The degree of involvement in a specific curriculum planning project is not so influential in ultimate perceptions of the importance of a curriculum as is the level of experience with curriculum work and planning. Throughout this three-year series of planning processes, teachers and principals perceived their roles as satisfying and positive no matter what type of role they ultimately played in the project. So long as the goals of each planning process were clearly defined and adhered to by project planners, the perceptions of process and ultimate product were positive. Yet when these three-year participants were compared concerning their general attitudes about the curriculum with non-participants in this specific process, no differences could be found. Involvement in this project did not alone account for positive perceptions of the district curriculum nor the usefulness of a district curriculum. What did appear to account for positive perceptions was the level of experience with curriculum work a teacher or principal might have. Those respondents who reported above average or a great deal of curriculum work experience, whether or not

Collaborative Planning

they were involved in this project, were the most positive about the usefulness of curriculum planning in general, the usefulness of having a district curriculum, and about the ultimate use to which a district would put its curriculum once it was in place. What this may suggest is that it is imperative to actively seek collaborative curriculum planning efforts no matter how broadly or how narrowly, if we wish to foster healthy attitudes among teachers and principals toward the curriculum and its usefulness in instructional planning. This case study would seem to suggest that the more experience we provide teachers with curriculum planning of any sort, the more favorably they will view curriculum work, the usefulness of a curriculum and the more balanced their views will become on the place of the curriculum and the textbook in general instructional planning.

Table 1. Committee functions, membership, products and timelines across three phases of the curriculum planning project.

Phase	Committee	Number of Members			Functions/Roles	Product	Timeline
		Teachers	Principals	Community			
1	Curriculum Steering Committee	16	16	0	1. Organise documentation process	Documentation Plan	2 months
					2. Plan development phase	Development Plan	7 months
					3. Lead documentation phase	-----	7 months
1	Curriculum Documentation Teams	114	16	0	1. Document all district curricula	Course Documentation outlines	6 months
1	Citizens' Steering Committee	0	0	4	1. Plan citizen orientation sessions	Orientation Plan	2 months
1	Citizens' Curriculum Committee	0	0	34	1. Attend orientation sessions	Citizens' Position Paper	6 months
2	Curriculum Steering Committee	16	16	0	1. Organise development phase	-----	1 month
					2. Lead development process	-----	6 months
					3. Review Task Force recommendations	-----	6 months
					4. Prioritise recommendations to create curriculum cycle	Curriculum Cycle	4 months
2	Subject Area Task Forces (16)	65	16	50	1. Research "should be" of curriculum area	-----	2 months
					2. Develop mission statement, rationale, goals, objectives, list of recommendations for subject area(s)	Task Force Report	6 months
3	Faculty Curriculum Council	15	5	0	1. Approve curriculum change proposals of Content Steering Councils	Recommendation Report	9 months
3	Content Steering Councils (4)	32	8	0	1. Review curriculum and develop curriculum change proposals	Curriculum Proposal(s)	9 months
3	Citizens' Curriculum Council	3	3	16	1. Review approved curriculum proposals	-----	9 months

Table 2. Instruments administered to delineate attitudes and perceptions of process and product of participants by committee and phase

Phase	Committee	Sample Size	Instruments Administered	Mode of Administration
1	Curriculum Steering Committee	32	1. TSAI 2. Hall Process Scale 3. Hall Product Scale 4. ESQ	Group meeting Group meeting Group meeting Group meeting
1	Curriculum Documentation	102	1. TSAI 2. Hall Process Scale 3. Hall Product Scale 4. ESQ	Group meeting Group meeting Group meeting Group meeting
2	Curriculum Steering Committee	32	1. Hall Process Scale 2. Hall Product Scale 3. ESQ	School Mail School Mail School Mail
2	Subject Area Task Forces (16)	131	1. Hall Process Scale 2. Hall Product Scale 3. ESQ	Mail Mail Mail
3	Faculty Curriculum Council	20	1. TSAI 2. CAI	School Mail School Mail
3	Content Steering Councils (4)	40	1. TSAI 2. CAI	School Mail School Mail
3	Stratified sample of non-participating teachers	150	1. TSAI 2. CAI	School Mail School Mail
3	Remainder of 1st phase participants (on other 12 Content Steering Councils)	74	1. TSAI 2. CAI	School Mail School Mail